

From: Fred Ebersole, Jr.  
To: Mike Powell  
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 1:45 PM  
Subject: I'm concerned about the change of regulations on media ownership.

The Federal Communications Commission is currently considering a proposal to abandon many of the regulations concerning media ownership in the United States. The proposed changes would affect everything from television to radio to newspapers, and would fundamentally reshape the nation's media structure at the local and the national level. Why should you care about the nation's media structure? Basically it will concentrate control of the nation's media into the hands of a few corporations. These corporations will decide what is newsworthy, and what isn't. So anything that is critical of them or the people they like won't get reported. And people like us, who are just Joe & Jane Regular Punks, will not have a chance to make our voices heard, or to get any coverage of issues that are important to us. Remember how the Seattle WTO protest participants were portrayed by the mainstream media as a bunch of weird rowdies who were breaking store windows for no reason? Well, that's what you can look forward to if these changes are adopted. These new rules will reduce even more the quality and range of news that we will have access to.

Read the New York Times Op-Ed by Bill Kovach, Chairman of the Committee of Concerned Journalists, and Tom Rosenstiel, Director of the Project for Excellence in Journalism.

If you care about fair, accurate news reporting, PLEASE SEND A LETTER OR AN EMAIL to FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell (his email address is [mpowell@fcc.gov](mailto:mpowell@fcc.gov)). The public comment period ends at the end of January, so hurry up and send your letter.

You can use the sample letter below as a template for your letter or email, and of course you can edit it as you want. Please keep in mind that respectful, to the point letters and emails are the most effective. If you have a lot of "this sucks" or "fuck you" in your message it will probably be disregarded, and all the effort you put into sending it will be wasted (which sucks, of course, but that's the way these kind of cookies crumble.)

Be sure to include your name & address in your letter!!!! This is REALLY IMPORTANT!!! They usually DO NOT PAY ATTENTION to anonymous letters & emails!

SAMPLE LETTER:

Dear Mr. Powell:

I am writing to tell you of my opposition to the proposed changes by your agency to the current Media Ownership Rules.

Further concentration of media ownership does not serve our democratic society based upon democratic principles, but instead undermines it. Following World War II, our government placed restrictions upon news media outlet ownership because of how totalitarian regimes used controlled media concentrated in the hands of a few corporations and government agencies to control their people and move the world towards war. The proposed changes to the current Media Ownership Rules completely undermines this principle that so many Americans have fought to defend from our country's birth to the present.

Furthermore, the series of reports released by the FCC about the current media marketplace are focused almost entirely on the economic impact of relaxing the ownership rules. They ignore the public's interest in a diverse and independent press. You have also scheduled only one public hearing regarding this issue. The FCC has barely publicized the proposed changes, and combined with a very short public comment period I can only surmise that you hope to sneak these changes past the American people. I certainly didn't find out about them as a result of anything that was done by your agency.

You should be ashamed that an agency under your leadership is not using what is in the best interests of the American public as its guiding principle, but instead is thinking of what is most profitable for a few huge corporations who only care about the bottom line, not about what is good for democracy.

Sincerely yours,

Frederick L. Ebersole, Jr.

1851 Morningstar Dr

Roaming Shores, OH 44084

From: Jamie Richards  
To: Mike Powell  
Date: Wed, Feb 19, 2003 1:47 PM  
Subject: Media Ownership Limitations

Mr. Powell,

My name is James Richards. I am a 23 year radio vet from Orlando, Florida. I am emailing in regard to the planned rewrite of the current media ownership limits.

I began my career in broadcasting in 1979. So as you probably can tell, I have seen quite a few changes in the radio business. Since the mid-90's, I can't even begin to tell you how many people I've heard say how fun radio used to be (before the big corporate take overs).

Really though, how fun radio is or isn't, is irrelevant. What is relevant however, is the state of the business, and how it is effecting its' work force, and the public that depends on it. Here's an update from the front lines for you.

For those of us who have dedicated years to serving the publics interest through entertainment and information, here's how we have been affected:

Job availability continues to plummet, as more and more companies such as Clear Channel use technology to allow one person to do the job of hundreds. They pipe in one persons voice to many cities, making the listening public think they're hearing a locally employed person (and on-air friend). When in fact, the voice they are hearing neither cares or knows anything about ALL of the cities he is communicating to. Nor can he provide the kind of Public Service (both on-air and in person) that the local personality used to be able to do. Nothing like calling your local Dj and him or her remembering your name.

Basically, more and more people who have been in radio for years, and cannot afford (or have the time) to return to college are being driven to the unemployment line. I recently spent from January 2002, to February 2003 searching for a job in radio. I was released from what was a great job on the Florida east coast, that is, until Cumulus broadcasting took over the station. They used a third party to buy us, deceiving the Attorney from West Palm Beach that owned us. Once they took over, it introduced a very negative attitude to the entire facility. Suddenly what was a team effort, became an "every man for himself environment". They then brought in their own management, and instantly 3 or 4 local people were replaced by personnel from outside the market. What was 3 or 4 became 5 or 6 and

more. All the goings on there even led to one of the older personalities (who had been an icon in the market for decades) having heart attack because of the stress of suddenly being 55 and not trained to do anything else in life.

After searching and searching with no luck with the big corporate radio companies, I finally found a job. Fortunately it was with a family owned station (not a corporate step child), and exactly 60 days AFTER my unemployment ran out.

Also, I was fortunate that it was just my wife and I that I had to worry about. But what if I had children? How would I have fed them?

Corporate radio has erroded the radiojob market, and I know that there are thousands of current and former radio employees out there who will agree.

I wish the FCC would take time to ask itself, and corporate radio a couple of questions?

Why?

Why do companies like Clear Channel and Cumulus feel that they have to continue buying more and more and more stations?

Why do they feel that they need several stations in every market?

Why do they feel that they need to make more and more and more money? Just like, why do the Saudis (who are wealthy beyond belief) feel they must continue to make more and more money for oil, when they could not possibly ever spend what they have now?

Why does corporate radio feel that it has the right to go into radio markets, decrease the size of its work force (claiming through bogus research the public doesn't care to hear DJ's), and begin pumping advertising dollars out of it, creating an environment where the small business owner can't afford to market his or herself?

Business should always give back at least a little of what it takes from society. And all companies like Clear Channel are doing, are taking and not giving back. Clear Chanel has even had the coconuts to buy the companies that promote local concerts. How much of the industry do they really feel they need to try and control?

In short, media ownership should be limited because of the following:

The Public.

The Publics access to information.

The Publics access to public service.

The Small Business owner who needs help in today's economy, and can't afford corporate radio and its' buy here and get **5** stations attitude.

The Recording Industry. who is being limited by the control corporate radio has over **so** many radio listeners.

And, last but not least, those **of us** who love the business, and are watching it dissolve with the help of corporate and satellite radio.

Thank you for your time.

Cordially,

James Richards

---

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Shopping - Send Flowers for Valentine's Day

<http://shopping.yahoo.com>

From: Jamie Richards  
To: Kathleen Abernathy  
Date: Wed, Feb 19.2003 1:48 PM  
Subject: Media Ownership Limits

Hello,

My name is James Richards. I am a 23 year radio vet from Orlando, Florida. I am emailing in regard to the planned rewrite of the current media ownership limits.

I began my career in broadcasting in 1979. So as you probably can tell, I have seen quite a few changes in the radio business. Since the mid-90's, I can't even begin to tell you how many people I've heard say how fun radio used to be (before the big corporate take overs).

Really though, how fun radio is or isn't, is irrelevant. What is relevant however, is the state of the business, and how it is effecting its' work force, and the public that depends on it. Here's an update from the front lines for you.

For those of us who have dedicated years to serving the publics interest through entertainment and information, here's how we have been affected:

Job availability continues to plummet, as more and more companies such as Clear Channel use technology to allow one person to do the job of hundreds. They pipe in one persons voice to many cities, making the listening public think they're hearing a locally employed person (and on-air friend). When in fact, the voice they are hearing neither cares or knows anything about ALL of the cities he is communicating to. Nor can he provide the kind of Public Service (both on-air and in person) that the local personality used to be able to do. Nothing like calling your local Dj and him or her remembering your name.

Basically, more and more people who have been in radio for years, and cannot afford (or have the time) to return to college are being driven to the unemployment line. I recently spent from January 2002, to February 2003 searching for a job in radio. I was released from what was a great job on the Florida east coast, that is, until Cumulus broadcasting took over the station. They used a third party to buy us, decieving the Attorney from West Palm Beach that owned us. Once they took over, it introduced a very negative attitude to the entire facility. Suddenly what was a team effort, became an "every man for himself environment". They then brought in their own management, and instantly 3 or 4 local people were replaced by personnel from outside the market. What was 3 or 4 became 5 or 6 and

more. All the goings on there even led to one of the older personalities (who had been an icon in the market for decades) having heart attack because of the stress of suddenly being 55 and not trained to do anything else in life.

After searching and searching with no luck with the big corporate radio companies, I finally found a job. Fortunately it was with a family owned station (not a corporate step child), and exactly 60 days **AFTER** my unemployment ran out.

Also, I was fortunate that it was just my wife and I that I had to worry about. But what if I had children? How would I have fed them?

Corporate radio has erroded the radiojob market, and I know that there are thousands of current and former radio employees out there who will agree.

I wish the FCC would take time to ask itself, and corporate radio a couple of questions?

Why?

Why do companies like Clear Channel and Cumulus feel that they have to continue buying more and more and more stations?

Why do they feel that they need several stations in every market?

Why do they feel that they need to make more and more and more money? Just like, why do the Saudis (who are wealthy beyond belief) feel they must continue to make more and more money for oil, when they could not possibly ever spend what they have now?

Why does corporate radio feel that it has the right to go into radio markets, decrease the size of its work force (claiming through bogus research the public doesn't care to hear DJ's), and begin pumping advertising dollars out of it, creating an environment where the small business owner can't afford to market his or herself?

Business should always give back at least a little of what it takes from society. And all companies like Clear Channel are doing, are taking and not giving back. Clear Chanel has even had the coconuts to buy the companies that promote local concerts. How much of the industry do they really feel they need to try and control?

In short, media ownership should be limited because of the following:

The Public.

The Publics access to information.

The Publics access to public service.

The Small Business owner who needs help in today's economy, and can't afford corporate radio and its' buy here and get 5 stations attitude.

The Recording Industry, who is being limited by the control corporate radio has over so many radio listeners.

And, last but not least, those of us who love the business, and are watching it dissolve with the help of corporate and satellite radio.

Thank you for your time

Cordially,

James Richards

---

Do you Yahoo!?

Yahoo! Shopping - Send Flowers for Valentine's Day

<http://shopping.yahoo.com>



**From:** Kennyosf@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** Wed, Feb 19.2003 2:51 PM  
**Subject:** Media Diversity

Dear Mr. Powell

Media diversity should be a top priority for the FCC. Concentration of the media cripples democracy.

I strongly urge you to preserve the rule prohibiting cross ownership of newspapers and television stations in the same market.

Thank you.

Betty Kenny

**CC:** kennyosf@aol.com

**From:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**To:** KAQUINN  
**Date:** Wed, Feb 19, 2003 3:21 PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Protect Children's Television!

**From:** jpayne@knowledgeu.com  
**To:** KathleenAbernathy  
**Date:** Wed, Feb 19, 2003 3:21 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen Q. Abernathy,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules,

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in **less** original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Janet Payne  
3135 Campus Dr  
San Mateo, California 94403-3132

cc:  
Senator Dianne Feinstein  
Senator Barbara Boxer  
Representative Tom Lantos

**From:** jpayne@knowledgeu.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Wed, Feb 19, 2003 3:21 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in **less** original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Janet Payne  
3135 Campus Dr  
San Mateo, California 94403-3132

cc:  
Senator Dianne Feinstein  
Senator Barbara Boxer  
Representative Tom Lantos

**From:** Mary Nolan  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Wed, Feb 19, 2003 10:12 PM  
**Subject:** FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Mary Nolan  
677 President Street  
Brooklyn, NY 11215

**From:** Mary Nolan  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Wed, Feb 19, 2003 10:12 PM  
**Subject:** FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to **be** planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Mary Nolan  
677 President Street  
Brooklyn, NY 11215

**From:** Mary Nolan  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Wed, Feb 19.2003 10:12 PM  
**Subject:** FCC protect media independence

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Mary Nolan  
677 President Street  
Brooklyn, NY 11215

From: Sanda Oslin  
To: Commissioner Adelstein  
Date: Thu, Feb 20.2003 7:04 AM  
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Sanda S. Oslin  
10061 State HWY 27  
Sturgeon Lake, MN 55783

---

Get Your Private, Free Email at <http://www.hotmail.com>



**From:** Sanda Oslin  
**To:** KathleenAbernathy  
**Date:** Thu, Feb 20, 2003 7:04 AM  
**Subject:** Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent *is* the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Sanda S. Oslin  
10061 State HWY 27  
Sturgeon Lake, MN 55783

---

Get Your Private, Free Email at <http://www.hotmail.com>

From: Sanda Oslin  
To: Michael Copps  
Date: Thu, Feb 20, 2003 7:04 AM  
Subject: Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Sanda S. Oslin  
10061 State HWY 27  
Sturgeon Lake, MN 55783

---

Get Your Private, Free Email at <http://www.hotmail.com>

From: Sanda Oslin  
To: Mike Powell  
Date: Thu. Feb 20, 2003 7:04 AM  
**Subject:** Keep media free and competitive

Dear Commissioner Powell:

One of the basic elements which help to keep the American media at least partially free and independent is the set of FCC regulations restricting consolidation and monopolies.

In the 2002 Biennial Review, the FCC appears to be planning to roll back many of these protective regulations: the Newspaper/Broadcast Cross-Ownership Rule, the National Broadcast Ownership Cap, the Local Radio Ownership Rule, the Duopoly Rule and the Dual Network Rule.

Relaxation or abandonment of the preceding rules will result in the purchase of local and independent newspapers and radio and television stations by large media giants. The cost to the American People and Democracy will be far too high if local news, reportorial freedom and access to a true variety of legitimate views are further compromised.

Commissioner Powell, I urge you to make sure the FCC does not relax or drop these vital regulatory rules.

Sincerely,

Sanda S. Oslin  
10061 State HWY 27  
Sturgeon Lake, MN 55783

---

Get Your Private, Free Email at <http://hrvwww.hotmail.com>

**From:** jomoore@rusd.k12.ca.us  
**To:** Michael Copps  
**Date:** Thu, Feb 20, 2003 1:12 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps

Dear FCC Commissioner Michael J. Copps,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in **less** original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will **be** affected.

Sincerely,

JoAnn Moore  
7675 Magnolia Ave.  
Riverside, California 92504

cc:  
Senator Dianne Feinstein  
Senator Barbara Boxer  
Representative Kevin Calvert

**From:** jomoore@rusd.k12.ca.us  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Thu, Feb 20, 2003 1:12 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan **S.** Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan **S.** Adelstein.

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

JoAnn Moore  
7675 Magnolia Ave.  
Riverside, California **92504**

cc:  
Senator Dianne Feinstein  
Senator Barbara Boxer  
Representative Kevin Calvert

**From:** bodom@attbi.com  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** Thu, Feb 20, 2003 1:12 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein

Dear FCC Commissioner Jonathan S. Adelstein,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in less original programming for children.

Lack of content standards results in "toxic" and inappropriate programming that is traumatizing our youth. Promiscuity and violence in widely broadcasted commercials and programs is influencing future generations resulting in a de-sensitized and less humane society.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Beverly Odom  
8065 Livorna Way  
Fair Oaks, California 95628

cc:  
Senator Dianne Feinstein  
Senator Barbara Boxer  
Representative Doug Ose

**From:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**To:** KAQUINN  
**Date:** Thu, Feb 20, 2003 1:12 PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Protect Children's Television!

**From:** bodom@attbi.com  
**To:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**Date:** Thu, Feb 20, 2003 1:12 PM  
**Subject:** Protect Children's Television!

FCC Commissioner Kathleen **Q.** Abernathy

Dear FCC Commissioner Kathleen **Q.** Abernathy,

The FCC must consider the unique needs of children in its upcoming rulemaking on broadcast ownership rules.

Children consume almost five and a half hours of media per day. Research has shown that media, particularly television, play a unique and powerful role in children's development.

The FCC should consider how further relaxation of media ownership rules would impact children's programming. Deregulation may reduce competition, increase commercialism and result in **less** original programming for children.

Lack of content standards results in "toxic" and inappropriate programming that is traumatizing our youth. Promiscuity and violence in widely broadcasted commercials and programs is influencing future generations resulting in a de-sensitized and **less** humane society.

Before making any regulatory changes to existing media ownership rules, the FCC must consider how children will be affected.

Sincerely,

Beverly Odom  
**8065** Livorna Way  
Fair Oaks, California **95628**

cc:  
Senator Dianne Feinstein  
Senator Barbara Boxer  
Representative Doug **Ose**



**From:** Kathleen Abernathy  
**To:** KAQUINN  
**Date:** Thu, Feb 20, 2003 1:12 PM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Protect Children's Television!